

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 30 2006

**CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION
UNDER 37 CFR §1.8**

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being transmitted on the date indicated below via facsimile to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, facsimile number (571) 273-8300.

Date

01-30-06

Marianne Boland

Marianne Boland

In re application of:)
Hunter et al.)
Serial No: 10/073,727)
Filed: February 11, 2002)
For: ENVIRONMENTAL)
CAMERAS)

Confirmation No.: 7604
Art Unit: 2632
Examiner: Nguyen, Tai
HP Docket No. 30005967-2
TKHR Docket No. 050828-1100

**Issue Fee Transmittal
Comments On Statement Of Reasons For Allowance**

Total Pages Transmitted (including cover sheet) - 4

JAN 30 2006

PATENTS

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:)	
Hunter et al.)	Confirmation No.: 7604
Serial No: 10/073,727)	Art Unit: 2632
Filed: February 11, 2002)	Examiner: Nguyen, Tai
)	HP Docket No. 30005967-2
For: ENVIRONMENTAL)	TKHR Docket No. 050828-1100
CAMERAS)	

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Mail Stop Issue Fee
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Sir:

The Examiner has made some broad conclusory statements in the Statement of Reasons for Allowance, which may be viewed as an oversimplification of the examination issues and if taken out of context, could give rise to an improper interpretation of the claims as well as the file history. For these reasons, Applicants provide the following comments to vouch the record and to ensure proper interpretation of the claims and history.

While Applicants agree with the Examiner that the stated reasons for allowance of claims 27-78 are indeed proper grounds for allowance of these claims, there are other additional reasons why these claims are allowable over the cited art of record, and Applicants do not admit that the stated reasons for allowance are the only reasons for allowance. For example, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are allowable for at least the reason that the feature "whereby detection of the indicator signal by a remote detection unit causes the remote detection unit to alert the person of the presence of the image capture device" and similar features are not suggested or taught by the cited art.

Further, in accordance with 35 U.S.C. Section 282: "Each claim of a patent (whether in independent, dependent, or multiple dependent form) shall be presumed valid independently of the validity of other claims; dependent or multiple dependent claims shall be

presumed valid even though dependent upon an invalid claim." Thus, the dependent claims that were not addressed by the Examiner in the reasons for allowance should not rise or fall, when construed in terms of validity, with their respective independent claims, but instead should be construed independently of their respective independent claims.

Also, the scope and validity of each claim (whether in independent, dependent, or multiple dependent form) should be determined based upon the entire combination of elements/features/steps in each claim, as opposed to only the particular feature or features pointed out by the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,


Charles W. Griggers, Reg. No. 47,283

Attorney for Applicants

BEST AVAILABLE COPY